Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent

application as amended herein. Claims 9-13 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 14, and 19 have been amended. No claims have been added or withdrawn.

Thus, claims 1-8 and 14-22 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-17, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as

being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0210804A filed by

Kimelman et al. (*Kimelman*). Claims 9-12 have been cancelled and, thus, the rejection of

claims 9-12 is moot. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, 14-17, and 19-

21 are not anticipated by *Kimelman* for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP"), in § 2131, states:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the
> claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art
> reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2
> USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in
> as complete detail as is contained in the … claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor
> Co.*, 869 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Thus, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated *only if* each and every element of the

claim is found in the cited reference and the cited reference must show the invention in as

complete detail as contained in the claim.

Amended claim 1 recites:

> (Original) An apparatus, comprising:
> a circuit to generate *a training pattern*;

> a debug circuit to generate debug information; and
> an information assembly unit to combine the training pattern with the debug
> information, *wherein the training pattern is to enable a receiver of a combined
> training pattern and debug information to maintain bit and symbol
> synchronization.*

(Emphasis added.) Independent claims 14 and 19 similarly recite "a training pattern" and

"wherein the training pattern is to enable a receiver of a combined training pattern and

debug information to maintain bit and symbol synchronization."

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Kimelman* does not disclose a training

pattern as recited in claims 1, 14, and 19. Rather, *Kimelman* merely discloses a context

word representing a context, for example, to represent an address of a bus transaction

using an index (see, e.g., paragraphs [0008], [0012], [0022], and [0042]). The Office

action has not identified and the Applicant is unable to find any disclosure in *Kimelman*

directed to a training pattern as recited in claims 1, 14, and 19. As described in the

Applicant's specification a training pattern may enable a receiver of the combined

training pattern and debug information to maintain bit and symbol synchronization (see,

e.g., [0007] of the application), by ensuring that enough data transitions occur (see, e.g.,

[0010]), by being moved to different wires for each packet to ensure that each wire

receives a training pattern (see, e.g., [0015]), and/or to provide parity information for

each packet (see, e.g., [0016]). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1,

14, and 19 are not anticipated by *Kimelman.*

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14. Claims

20-21 depend from claim 19. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the

limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that

claims 2-6, 15-17, and 20-21 are not anticipated by *Kimelman.*

Application No. 10/749,660
Response to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17993
TC/A.U. 2113

Claim Rejections § 103

Claims 8, 13, 18, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kimelman* in view of an excerpt from Wikipedia (*Wikipedia*). Claim 13 was cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claim 13 is moot. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 18, and 22 are over *Kimelman* in view of *Wikipedia* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Wikipedia is cited as teaching packet mechanisms of "[d]ifferent communication protocols ... byte level." Whether or not *Wikipedia* discloses the limitations cited by the Office action, it does not teach or suggest "a training pattern" and "wherein the training pattern is to enable a receiver of a combined training pattern and debug information to maintain bit and symbol synchronization," as recited in claims 1, 14, and 19. Because neither *Kimelman* nor *Wikipedia* teach or suggest the above-cited claim limitations, no combination of *Kimelman* and *Wikipedia* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claims 1, 14, and 19. Claims 8, 18, and 22 respectively depend from claims 1, 14, and 19. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 18, and 22 are patentable over *Kimelman* in view of *Wikipedia*. The Applicant further notes that the Office action does not demonstrate a priority date of *Wikipedia* to demonstrate that it qualifies as prior art to the present application.

Application No. 10/749,660
Response to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17993
TC/A.U. 2113

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: ____December 29, 2006____   ____/Philip A. Pedigo/_____
                                  Philip A. Pedigo
                                  Reg. No. 52,107
                                  Attorney for Intel Corporation

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor, & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 712-5560 or (502) 439-8778